

Remarks

Claim 1 has been amended to emphasize that the initial communication is passed to be modified to become a final communication when stored data extracted when composing the initial communication indicates that human modification is required and, the initial communication is treated as the final communication without passing to be modified when stored data extracted when composing the initial communication indicates that human modification is not required.

Thus, according to the claimed invention, the initial communication is not passed for modification to become a final communication but treated as the final communication when stored data extracted when composing the initial communication indicates that human modification is not required.

In maintaining the rejection of the claims, in the advisory action the examiner refers particularly to Figures 3B-C, col. 6 line 36 to col. 7 line 54; and to col 16, lines 36-55.

In those passages, col 7, lines 51-52 states:

“.....the proof copy review is not an essential step in the inventive process.”, and, FIG 3B, bottom box ** explains that after the first time through the loop, proof copy transmit/approval may be skipped by indication of user on the prior proof copy form; flow proceeds at B.”

Thus, Powers actually teaches that it is only permissible to eliminate the step of passing the (second) proof copy for review by the sender for possible modification after a review of the (first) proof copy (initial communication) by the sender has already taken place.

The step of passing the (first) proof copy (initial communication) for review must

always take place whatever the content of the stored data extracted when composing the first proof copy (initial communication), whereas, in contrast, as pointed out above, a decision as to whether or not to pass the initial communication for review depends on the content of the stored data extracted when preparing the initial communication - when the content stored data extracted when preparing the initial communication so indicates, the initial communication is not passed for review but treated as the final communication and sent to the recipient.

It is respectfully submitted therefore that, the teaching of Powers does not compensate for the deficiency of the Pollack teaching and that the claims cannot be deemed unpatentable under 35 USC 103 over Pollack in view of Powers.

Favorable reconsideration of the application is requested.

Respectfully submitted,
/Robert W.J. Usher/
Robert W.J. Usher
Customer 04518; reg 30932
212 633 1076